

In re Patent Application:

FLICK

Serial No. 09/650,425

Filed: August 29, 2000

as recited in independent Claim 1, for example, is directed to a vehicle security system comprising at least one security sensor and a security controller connected thereto. The vehicle security system also includes a siren comprising a housing and a siren electrical signal generator circuit carried by the housing for generating an electrical siren security alarm signal responsive to the security controller. The claim further recites that the siren comprises a shock detector circuit carried by the housing for processing an electrical shock sense signal for the security controller, and an electrical/mechanical (E/M) transducer carried by the housing for sounding a siren security alarm responsive to the electrical siren security alarm signal.

By combining the siren signal and shock sensor components, for example, into the common housing, a compact, portable and readily installed device is provided which can be used alone or added to upgrade an existing vehicle security system as disclosed on page 13, lines 14-17 of Applicant's specification. In addition, the invention may be readily retrofitted to an existing vehicle security system with only a few simple electrical connections made within the engine compartment as disclosed on page 9, lines 26-32 of Applicant's specification. The present invention therefore eliminates the need to piecemeal several different components to achieve a vehicle security system having the above-referenced elements.

II. The Claims Are Patentable Over The Prior Art

The Mueller et al. patent discloses a vehicle security system including a plurality of spaced apart discrete components. In particular, Mueller et al. discloses in FIG. 1 a first siren 33 under the hood of the vehicle and a second

In re Patent Application:

FLICK

Serial No. 09/650,425

Filed: August 29, 2000

siren 81 at the rear window area of the vehicle. A shock sensor 64 is installed within the passenger compartment of the vehicle. Mueller et al. in FIGS. 9 and 10 also illustrates two embodiments of shock sensors 64, 64', each being self-contained within a respective housing 226, 232 without any additional components therein. Similarly, FIGS. 17 and 18 illustrate a conventional siren 450 including its own housing 452, which is separate from the respective housings of the shock sensors 64, 64'.

The Examiner is correct to note that the Mueller et al. reference does not disclose the siren comprising a housing and other components, including the shock sensing circuitry, contained within the housing as in the claimed invention. The Examiner contends that because Mueller et al. discloses a housing for the receiver/controller, it would have been obvious to house other components of the system to protect them from damage due to environmental factors such as moisture, rocks, tar, etc.

The Examiner cites the 1965 CCPA case of *In re Larson* and contends that making separate known devices integral in a housing is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. Applicant submits that the Examiner has mischaracterized *Larson* and further asserts the case does not deal with positioning devices in a housing, but rather merely deals with a manner of connecting components.

It is respectfully asserted that not only does Mueller et al. fail to render the claimed invention obvious, but indeed it teaches away from the claimed invention. Mueller et al. discloses the shock sensor and siren devices being discrete and widely spaced apart in the vehicle. Separate respective housings are provided for the siren and

In re Patent Application:

FLICK

Serial No. 09/650,425

Filed: August 29, 2000

shock sensor. There is simply no fair teaching or suggestion in Mueller et al. or any other prior art reference to disregard the clear teachings of Mueller et al. in an attempt to produce the claimed invention. It appears that the Examiner is attempting to use impermissible hindsight reconstruction to modify Mueller et al. where indeed the reference teaches away from the claimed invention.

Accordingly, it is submitted that independent Claim 1 is patentable over the prior art. Claims 11, 19 and 25 are similar to independent Claim 1 and are also patentable. In view of the patentability of the independent claims, it is submitted that their dependent claims, which recite yet further distinguishing features are also patentable. Accordingly, these dependent claims require no further discussion herein.

CONCLUSION

In view of the arguments provided herein, it is submitted that all the claims are patentable. Accordingly, a Notice of Allowance is requested in due course. Should any minor informalities need to be addressed, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



MARK R. MALEK
Reg. No. 46,894
Allen, Dyer, Doppelt, Milbrath
& Gilchrist, P.A.
255 S. Orange Avenue, Suite 1401
Post Office Box 3791
Orlando, Florida 32802
407/841-2330

In re Patent Application:

FLICK

Serial No. 09/650,425

Filed: August 29, 2000

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: DIRECTOR, U.S. PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE, BOX AF, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20231, on this 30th day of April, 2002.

